

Serial No. 10/692,634

Attorney Docket No. CS21907RA

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 through 24 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 17 have been amended.

Claims 1 through 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. US 6,885,874 B2 to Grube, et al. ("Grube, et al. patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. US 6,675,006 B1 to Diaz, et al. ("Diaz, et al. patent").

Claim 1 as amended provides, *inter alia*, coordinating collection of data by the wireless communication device with the at least one remote device. Support for the added recitation is found at page 14, lines 1 through 4, and page 15, lines 9 through 14, of the specification. Claim 17 provides, *inter alia*, a second wireless communication device including a second short-range transceiver to receive the request signal and a second video sensor to collect data relating to the incident event in response to the request signal, wherein the first wireless communication device coordinates collection of data with the second wireless communication device, and the second short-range transceiver transmits the collected data to the designated location.

In contrast, the Grube, et al. patent describes a group location sharing service ("GLSS") in which an initiating communication unit sends a GLSS initiation request message to a GLSS controller, and the prospective subscribers receive the GLSS initiation request message from the GLSS controller. Thereafter, the GLSS controller registers the participating subscribers, or otherwise maintains a list of the participating subscribers (see col. 7, line 54, through col. 8, line 35). Accordingly, the GLSS controller coordinates operation of the GLSS, including

Serial No. 10/692,634

Attorney Docket No. CS21907RA

coordination of data collection among the communication devices. The Grube, et al. patent does not describe or suggest coordinating collection of data by the wireless communication device (i.e., first wireless communication device) with one or more other remote devices, as required by claims 1 and 17. Likewise, the Diaz, et al. patent does not describe or suggest any type of coordination of data collection by the wireless communication device with one or more other remote devices. Therefore, claims 1 and 17 distinguish patentably from the Grube, et al. patent, the Diaz, et al. patent, and the suggested combination of these patents.

Claims 2 through 6 and 18 through 24 depend from and include all limitations of independent claims 1 and 17. Therefore, claims 2 through 6 and 18 through 24 distinguish patentably from the Grube, et al. patent, the Diaz, et al. patent, and the suggested combination of these patents for the reasons stated above for independent claims 1 and 17.

Claim 7 provides, *inter alia*, receiving information from the remote device about a designated location, and transmitting the recorded data to the designated location. Claim 17 as amended provides, *inter alia*, a first wireless communication device including a first short-range transceiver to transmit a request signal including information about a designated location, and a first video sensor to collect data relating to an incident event in response to a user activation input, and a second wireless communication device including a second short-range transceiver to receive the request signal and a second video sensor to collect data relating to the incident event in response to the request signal, wherein the first wireless communication device coordinates collection of data with the second wireless communication device, and the second short-range transceiver transmits the collected data to the designated location.

Serial No. 10/692,634

Attorney Docket No. CS21907RA

In contrast, the Grube, et al. patent describes a GLSS in which an initiating communication unit sends a GLSS initiation request message to a GLSS controller, and the prospective subscribers receive the GLSS initiation request message from the GLSS controller. The GLSS initiation request message identifies the initiating device and the desire of the initiating device to initiate the GLSS (see col. 7, line 54, through col. 8, line 35). Generally, the Grube, et al. patent is not concerned with any type of messaging about a designated location, because the destination of messages for each subscriber is predetermined to be either GLSS controller or, in the alternative, with another subscriber. The Grube, et al. patent does not describe or suggest receiving information from the remote device about a designated location, let alone transmitting the recorded data to the designated location, as required by claims 1 and 17. Likewise, the Diaz, et al. patent does not describe or suggest any type of messaging about a designated location for transmitting recorded data. Therefore, claims 7 and 17 distinguish patentably from the Grube, et al. patent, the Diaz, et al. patent, and the suggested combination of these patents.

Claims 8 through 12 and 18 through 24 depend from and include all limitations of independent claims 7 and 17. Therefore, claims 8 through 12 and 18 through 24 distinguish patentably from the Grube, et al. patent, the Diaz, et al. patent, and the suggested combination of these patents for the reasons stated above for independent claims 7 and 17.

Claim 13 provides, *inter alia*, correlating the incident information with the at least one portion of the previously received information that relates to the incident information. Claim 17 as amended provides, *inter alia*, correlating incident information associated with the incident

Serial No. 10/692,634

Attorney Docket No. CS21907RA

event with the at least one portion of previously received information that relates to the incident information.

In contrast, the Grube, et al. patent describes the operation of a GLSS controller to implement the GLSS at col. 13, line 5, through col. 15, line 13. Referring to col. 13, lines 45 through 60, in particular, the GLSS controller determines whether a group location table is already initiated at step 509. The GLSS controller creates a new table if a table does not exist, and the GLSS controller rejects the GLSS service initiation request by sending a rejection response if a table does exist. The Grube, et al. patent does not describe or suggest correlating the incident information with the at least one portion of the previously received information that relates to the incident information, as required by claims 1 and 17, since the GLSS only maintains a group location table and does not maintain incident information for correlation purposes. Likewise, the Diaz, et al. patent does not describe or suggest any type of correlation of incident information with previously received information that relates to the incident information. Therefore, claims 7 and 17 distinguish patentably from the Grube, et al. patent, the Diaz, et al. patent, and the suggested combination of these patents.

Claims 14 through 16, and 18 through 24 depend from and include all limitations of independent claims 13 and 17. Therefore, claims 14 through 16, and 18 through 24 distinguish patentably from the Grube, et al. patent, the Diaz, et al. patent, and the suggested combination of these patents for the reasons stated above for independent claims 13 and 17.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1 through 24 are respectfully requested.

Serial No. 10/692,634

Attorney Docket No. CS21907RA

CONCLUSION


No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Brown, Daniel P., et al.

Please forward all correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Law Department (HDW)
600 North US Highway 45, AS437
Libertyville, IL 60048


Hisashi D. Watanabe
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,465
Telephone: (847) 523-2322
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350

04/10/06
Date